

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 22-26 are pending. Claim 22 has been amended. Claim 27 has been added. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing Claims 1-9. Claims 22-26 are rejected. The rejections are respectfully traversed and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102**1. Kitano**

“Claims 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kitano et al (US 2001/0003966 A1).” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 is patentable over Kitano at least because it recites “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession.”

As shown in the subject application, for example in FIG. 2, it is clear that the cleaning member 130 directly covers bottom face 123 of receiving recession 120. In other words, the cleaning member 130 is in direct contact with the bottom face 123 of receiving recession 120.

In direct contrast, Kitano discloses the use of “protrusions 205e” that teach away from “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession” as recited by Claim 22. As can be seen in Fig. 17 of Kitano, the “protrusions 205e” in Kitano clearly separate the cleaning member (“nozzle plate 95”) from the bottom face of the receiving recession (“cleaning space T” where the “bottom face” of “cleaning space T” is the line shown by “suction port 205c”). Thus, because of the “protrusions 205e” in Kitano, the “nozzle plate 95” (cleaning member) is not directly covering the bottom face of the “cleaning space T” (receiving recession). As Kitano teaches, a “plurality of protrusions 205e are provided around the cleaning space T on the top face of the cleaning block 205. By virtue of the protrusions 205e, the lower face of the outer body 97 of the discharge nozzle 85 abuts to the protrusions 205e, during the cleaning, producing a gap between the outer body 97 and the cleaning block.” (Kitano, Para. [0104]). Therefore, Kitano clearly teaches away from and also fails to teach, suggest or disclose “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession” as recited by Claim 22. Applicant thus respectfully requests the withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection because Claim 22, and dependent Claims 23-26, are all allowable over Kitano.

2. Kamiya

“Claims 22, 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamiya” U.S. Pat. No. 5,273,192. (Incorrectly cited as “US 5,772,764” in Pg. 3, Para. 4 of the Office Action). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 is patentable over Kamiya at least because it recites “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession.”

As shown in the subject application, for example in FIG. 2, it is clear that the cleaning member 130 directly covers bottom face 123 of receiving recession 120. In other words, the cleaning member 130 is in direct contact with the bottom face 123 of receiving recession 120.

In direct contrast, Kamiya fails to teach, suggest or disclose “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession.” As can be seen in at least FIG. 2 and FIG. 4 of Kamiya, the cleaning member (which the Examiner compares to “sealing ring 21”) fails to directly cover the bottom face of the receiving recession (the “air space 30” in “cleaning unit 13” where the “bottom face” is the bottom edge of the “cleaning unit 13” box). Neither the “sealing ring 21” nor the “nozzle 15” is in direct contact with the bottom face of the receiving recession (“air space 30” in “cleaning unit 13”) in Kamiya. As can be seen in FIG. 2 and FIG. 4 of Kamiya, there is a wide gap between “sealing ring 21” or “nozzle 15” and the bottom face of the receiving recession (“air space 30” in “cleaning unit 13”). Therefore, Kamiya fails to teach, suggest or disclose “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession” as recited by Claim 22, and Applicant thus respectfully requests the withdrawal of the § 102(b) rejection because Claim 22 and dependent Claims 24-26 are all allowable over Kamiya.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

“Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasebe et al (US 5,374,312) in view of Park et al (US 6,109,843).” This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 23 depends from allowable claim 22, and Hasebe in view of Park fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claim 22, at least the limitation “the cleaning member directly covering the bottom face of the receiving recession” of Claim 22.

Hasebe, for instance, fails to disclose a cleaning unit with a body comprising a receiving recession, or any equivalent structure, so it necessarily follows that Hasebe fails to teach, suggest or disclose a “cleaning member” directly covering the bottom face of a receiving recession because Hasebe entirely lacks a “receiving recession” in the first place.

Park fails to cure this deficiency of Hasebe because Park also fails to teach, suggest or disclose a cleaning unit with a body comprising a receiving recession, or any equivalent structure. Park’s cleaning means also uses a “sprinkler 18” in a “bowl 16” so for at least this reason, Park is nonanalogous art.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection because Claim 23 is allowable over Hasebe in view of Park.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing Claims 1-9.

New Claim 27

New Claim 27 is allowable over the prior art. Because new Claim 27 recites the limitation of the “body is hexahedron-shaped” it is allowable over Kitano, because the “cleaning block 205 [in Kitano] is, as shown in [Figure] 16, formed in substantially cylindrical shape.” As can be seen in at least FIG. 3 of Kamiya, the “cleaning unit 13” and the “receptacle 22” that forms it (in FIG. 2 of Kamiya) is of a rectangular prism shape. Hasebe and Park fail to teach, suggest or disclose any cleaning units comprising bodies. Therefore, for at least these reasons, new Claim 27 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Claims 1-9 and 22-27 are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the number below in order to speed the prosecution of this application.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2257.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 23, 2008

By: Jenny Sung REG. NO. 60,435 FOR
Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Reg. No. 48,639
Attorney for Applicants

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP
2033 Gateway Place, Suite 400
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Fax: (408) 392-9262

FILED VIA EFS CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) via the USPTO's EFS-Web electronic filing system on July 23, 2008.	
<u>Jenny Sung</u> Kieun "Jenny" Sung Attorney for Applicant(s)	REG. NO 60,435 FOR 07-23-08 Date of Signature